

REMARKS

In the Claims

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the review of the present application. Claims 1, 2, 3, 6-15, 37-38 and 41-42 are currently pending in the application. As discussed in greater detail below, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6 and 41. Claims 4-5 and 39-40 have been canceled. Claims 16-36 were previously withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

The Office states that claims 5-6 and 41-42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. See Office action dated May 9, 2007, page 5.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claims 4 and 5. Claim 6 has been amended to be dependent on claim 1. Claim 41 has been rewritten in independent form.

As Applicant has overcome the objections, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 1-15 and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1121, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, the Office states that the claims are incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicant has amended claim 1 (this amendment also reflected in claim 41) to specifically claim an “output for discharging of distilled liquid product”. As such, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) Rejections – Obviousness (Mugele, Kraner and Silinski)

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-13, 15 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mugele (5,169,502) in view of Kraner (6,497,555) and Silinski et al (5,102,503).

Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 6 and 41, as well as cancellation of claims 4-5 and 39-40 have made this rejection moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons all of the claims of the present application are patentable over the art of record. It is believed that all of the claim rejections have been addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and issuance of a notice of allowance are respectfully requested. If any matter arises which may expedite issuance of a notice of allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned, at the telephone number given below.

Applicants request that \$810.00 be charged to deposit account number 50-4383 to cover the fee for the Request for Continued Examination. Applicants also request a three-month extension of time. Kindly charge the \$2,230.00 extension of time fees to deposit account number 50-4383. The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if any matters remain outstanding so that they may be resolved expeditiously.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michelle Saquet Temple/

Michelle Saquet Temple
Registration No. 48834
Attorney for Applicant

October 31, 2007

DEKA Research & Development Corp.
340 Commercial Street
Manchester, NH 03101
Tel: (603) 669-5139 Fax: (603) 624-0573